

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 455

September 21, 1995, 12:53 p.m.  
Page S-14019 Temp. Record

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS/Line-Item Veto

**SUBJECT:** Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . .  
. H.R. 1868. Jeffords motion to table the Harkin amendment No. 2725.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 76-24

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, H.R. 1868, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996, will provide \$12.34 billion in new budget authority for foreign aid programs in fiscal year (FY) 1996. This amount is \$2.43 billion below the President's request, and \$1.19 billion below the FY 1995 appropriated amount.

**The Harkin amendment** would express the sense of the Senate: 1) that conferees on S. 4, the Line-Item Veto Bill, should meet by September 26; 2) that the conferees should resolve their differences on S. 4 before the President must act on any FY 1996 appropriations bill; and 3) that S. 4 should be made retroactive for any FY 1996 appropriations bills that might be enacted prior to the enactment of S. 4.

Debate was limited by unanimous consent. Following debate, Senator Jeffords moved to table the Harkin amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

The Harkin amendment is a political stunt. Its Democratic supporters hope to portray Republicans as dragging their feet on passing the line-item veto bill. Many of these same Senators, of course, were not very helpful in passing the original bill, nor were most of them eager to pass the line-item veto when they controlled Congress and Republicans were in the White House. Given these facts, they should not be so quick to charge Republicans with foot-dragging.

The end, compromise line-item veto bill that finally passed the Senate is radically different than the bill that passed the House. With the huge crush of other business being considered by this Republican-controlled Congress, much of which is time-sensitive, the issue of giving the President the line-item veto has not been given top-priority, especially because the different approaches taken

(See other side)

YEAS (76)			NAYS (24)		NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (54 or 100%)	Democrats (22 or 48%)		Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (24 or 52%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Hutchison	Akaka		Baucus		
Ashcroft	Inhofe	Boxer		Biden		
Bennett	Jeffords	Bryan		Bingaman		
Bond	Kassebaum	Bumpers		Bradley		
Brown	Kempthorne	Byrd		Breaux		
Burns	Kyl	Conrad		Daschle		
Campbell	Lott	Dodd		Dorgan		
Chafee	Lugar	Glenn		Exon		
Coats	Mack	Heflin		Feingold		
Cochran	McCain	Inouye		Feinstein		
Cohen	McConnell	Johnston		Ford		
Coverdell	Murkowski	Levin		Graham		
Craig	Nickles	Mikulski		Harkin		
D'Amato	Packwood	Moseley-Braun		Hollings		
DeWine	Pressler	Moynihan		Kennedy		
Dole	Roth	Murray		Kerrey		
Domenici	Santorum	Nunn		Kerry		
Faircloth	Shelby	Pell		Kohl		
Frist	Simpson	Pryor		Lautenberg		
Gorton	Smith	Reid		Leahy		
Gramm	Snowe	Rockefeller		Lieberman		
Grams	Specter	Sarbanes		Robb		
Grassley	Stevens			Simon		
Gregg	Thomas			Wellstone		
Hatch	Thompson					
Hatfield	Thurmond					
Helms	Warner					

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

1—Official Business  
2—Necessarily Absent  
3—Illness  
4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

AY—Announced Yea  
AN—Announced Nay  
PY—Paired Yea  
PN—Paired Nay

by the Houses in their respective bills threaten to make any conference held contentious and lengthy. Congress must pass spending bills now and meet reconciliation instructions; there will be time to complete a conference on the line-item bill afterwards.

For now, though, we do not favor continually voting on whether the House should seek a conference, or when conferees will meet, or what they will decide. All will be decided in due course, according to the schedules as they are set by the leaders in both bodies. Neither side should attempt to dictate the schedule of the other. Some of us who oppose the Harkin amendment favor passing the line-item veto, and some of us oppose it. Some of us are Democrats, and some of us are Republicans. We are united on one point, though, which is that the Harkin amendment is ill-advised. We urge all Senators to vote to defeat it.

**Those opposing** the motion to table contended:

We have offered this amendment to nudge our Republican colleagues along. The House had as part of its Contract With America a promise that it would pass a line-item veto bill within 100 days. It met that promise on February 6. The Senate followed suit by passing a line-item veto bill on March 23. In the normal course of events, a conference would have been held within a few days. However, though the Senate called for a conference, the House did not act for 168 days, and then only after the Senate adopted a sense-of-the-Senate amendment calling on the House to appoint conferees. Conferees were appointed on September 7, but a conference has not yet been called. We find it odd that the House would consider this issue so important that it would promise to consider it within the first 100 days, but that it has so far not found it important enough after passing its version of the line-item veto to follow through by resolving differences with the Senate and seeing it actually enacted into law. The appearance is that our House colleagues enjoy the favorable press that comes from voting to pass the line-item veto into law, but that they are not at all eager to succeed in actually seeing it become law. Image and reality have seemed to separate. The Harkin amendment points out the delays that have occurred and expresses the sense of the Senate that they should not go on any longer. The amendment further finds that any bill that is ever enacted into law should be made retroactive so that President Clinton will have the chance to veto line-items in the spending bills on which we are currently working. Our colleagues have said many times over the years that they would support a line-item veto bill whether the President were a Republican or a Democrat; now is there chance to prove it, by voting in favor of the Harkin amendment.